

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, applicants through their attorney, respectfully thank Examiner Ho for having an interview held on February 28, 2008 to discuss proposed claim changes as now provided herewith.

Applicants respond hereby to the office action dated January 2, 2008. Claims 1, 6, and 11 are amended hereby. Claims 1-13 remain pending hereinafter, where Claims 1, 6, and 11 are independent claims.

Favorable consideration and allowance of the claims of the present application are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph as allegedly containing subject matter which is not described in the specification. The Examiner indicates in the Office Action that the term “asynchronous” in the claims is used in a different context from the term “asynchronous” in the specification. In response, the term “asynchronously” in Claims 1, 6, and 11 have been removed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph

Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner indicates in the Office Action that “said steps” in Claim 6 lacks antecedent basis. In the response, Claim 6 is amended as above to provide a proper antecedent basis.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hasha et al. (US Patent No. 6,993,771) (hereinafter Hasha) in view of Lortz et al. (US Patent No. 6,438,618) (hereinafter Lortz).

In response, Claims 1 and 6 are being amended to recite further “wherein said hierarchy of event categories represents an importance or priority hierarchy based on an object-oriented configuration software executing in said server host and said at least one client host”. The added limitation is supported in the paragraphs [0017] and [0021] of the corresponding published application (US PGPUB No. US2005/0193394A1). Therefore, no new matter is entered.

Though Hasha discloses “the event type may be hierarchically organized”, Hasha, Lortz, and the combination of them do not teach or suggest “an importance or priority hierarchy based on an object-oriented configuration software” in amended Claims 1 and 6. Therefore, amended Claims 1 and 6 are patentably distinct over Hasha, Lortz, and the combination of them.

Claims 2-5 are dependent claims of amended Claim 1. Therefore, in the virtue of dependency, Claims 2-5 are patentably distinct over Hasha, Lortz, and the combination of them. Claims 7-10 are dependent claims of amended Claim 6. Therefore, in the virtue of dependency, Claims 7-10 are patentably distinct over Hasha, Lortz, and the combination of them.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hasha et al. (US Patent No. 6,993,771) (hereinafter Hasha) in view of Lortz et al. (US Patent No. 6,438,618) (hereinafter Lortz) and in further view of Lomet et al. (US Patent No. 6,182,086) (hereinafter Lomet).

In response, Claim 11 is being amended to recite further “wherein said hierarchy of event categories represents an importance or priority hierarchy based on an object-oriented configuration software executing in said server host and said at least one client host”. The added limitation is supported in the paragraphs [0017] and [0021] of the corresponding published application (US PGPUB No. US2005/0193394A1). Therefore, no new matter is entered.

Though Hasha discloses “the event type may be hierarchically organized”, Hasha, Lortz, Lomet and the combination of them do not teach or suggest “an importance or priority hierarchy based on an object-oriented configuration software” in amended Claim 11. Therefore, amended Claim 11 is patentably distinct over Hasha, Lortz, Lomet and the combination of them.

Claims 12-13 are dependent claims of amended Claim 11. Therefore, in the virtue of dependency, Claims 12-13 are patentably distinct over Hasha, Lortz, Lomet, and the combination of them.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite prosecution of this case, it is respectfully requested that he call the applicant's attorney at (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven Fischman
Registration No. 34,594

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

SF:JP:av